

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 8,872,931 (Chivaluri). Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chivaluri and U.S. Patent No. 5,367,609 (Hopper et al).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Chvaluri is cited for teaching “each management agent includes alarms and information that defines alarm criteria and enables corrective action to be taken...” [column 2, lines 28-37] “the management agent includes a set of default corrective scripts, defined by user, that are automatically carried out in response to certain defined alarms” [column 6, lines 29-33] and also Chvaluri teaches “if the alarm is intended to be triggered when the quantity exceeds a threshold value, then ... it will not go off again until the alarm quantity falls below the threshold and then exceeds the threshold again” [column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 2]. The Examiner relies upon these disclosures of Chvaluri for teaching “activation/deactivation of rule sets such that the satisfaction of logging criteria for a rule set causes the status of other rule sets to change”.

Firstly, “rule sets” are defined in the present specification for “automatic filtering of error logs...to determine if a combination of logs satisfies a given criteria” (page 1, lines 20-22). In part 4 of the Office Action (page 2), Examiner reads applicant’s recited “rule sets” with the “management agent” in Chvaluri, and reads applicant’s recited “rule set criteria” with “default corrective script” in Chvaluri. Paradoxically, Examiner also reads applicant’s “error logs” with “certain

defined alarms” of Chvaluri, but also reads applicant’s recited “rule set activation keys” on “defined alarms” of Chvaluri. Applicant respectfully submits that “error logs” and “rule set activation keys” are completely separate technical features of the claimed invention, yet the Examiner contends that the features are described by the “defined alarms” of Chvaluri.

Further, the Examiner appears to contend that “activation/deactivation of rule sets such that the satisfaction of logging criteria for a rule set causes the status of other rule sets to change” is taught by Chvaluri’s description of “activation/deactivation of the *management agent* such that the satisfaction of logging criteria for a *management agent* causes the status of *other management agents* to change.” There is no suggestion in Chvaluri that the management agents are subjected to any “change”. Rather, each management agent includes a set of default corrective scripts, defined by the user, that are automatically carried out in response to certain defined alarms.

Even if Chvaluri is given the most purposive of possible constructions, Chvaluri is relevant for teaching a management agent that includes a set of default corrective scripts, defined by the user, that are automatically carried out in response to certain defined alarms, and “filtering” of the alarms until the alarm quantity exceeds a certain threshold value. This construction still does not equate applicant’s “error logs” with the “alarms” of Chvaluri. Thus, Chvaluri is noteworthy for teaching a management agent including a set of corrective scripts that are automatically carried out in response to certain defined alarms, where those alarms may be filtered so as not to be generated until the quantity of such

alarms exceeds a certain threshold. Consequently, the most that can be said of Chvaluri is that it teaches applicant's recited "rule sets" which, as discussed above, function to automatically filter error logs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever in Chvaluri that these "rule sets" may be activated or deactivated based on certain error logging criteria "so as to cause the status of **other** rule sets to change", as claimed in claims 1, 3, and 4. (Applicant notes that since this recitation relates to issues previously discussed and still on-going, it should not be considered as 'new issue'). Chvaluri discloses the filtering of error logs (i.e. "rule sets"), and the execution of "corrective scripts" in response to the filtered error logs. Applicant's invention is not concerned with "corrective scripts" but rather the provision of useful information (i.e. logs) to a network administrator, where this provision of useful information is facilitated by a system in which rule sets are activated or deactivated (which is nowhere disclosed in Chvaluri) in accordance with changes in status defined by certain "activation keys" (nowhere disclosed or suggested in Chvaluri), so as to cause the status of **other** rule sets to change (again, nowhere disclosed or suggested in Chvaluri).

For the foregoing reasons, the present application including claims 1 to 5 is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Frank Chau
Registration No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889